DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 135 203 FL 008 185

AUTHOR Sole, Yolanda Russinovich
TITLE Sociocultural Determinants of Symmetrical and Asymetrical Address Forms in Spanish.
PUB DATE 76
NOTE 23p.
AVAILABLE FROM Yolanda Russinovich Sole, Dept. of Spanish and Portuguese, University of Texas, Austin, Texas 78712f

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Communicative Competence (Languages); Cultural Awareness; Cultural Factors; Grammar; Language Instruction; Language Patterns; Language Proficiency; *Language Usage; Language Variation; *Pronouns; *Second Language Learning; Semantics; Social Differences; Social Relations; *Sociocultural Patterns; Sociolinguistics; *Spanish

ABSTRACT

The most basic and simplest act of communicative competence in Spanish involves the appropriate decoding and selection of the pronominal address forms "tu" and "Usted." Their selection and semantic value are not, however, determined by linguistic criteria alone. Since "tu/Ud." mark the relative status of each speaker in a given context, their selection is primarily dependent upon sociocultural factors. If students of Spanish are to gain some insight into the distribution and potential value of each form, they must first be made aware of the factors that determine it. They may understand that "tu/Ud." mark the relative status of each speaker, that formal contexts may require a symmetrical "Ud.," and that symmetrical and asymmetrical uses are possible. But they must also realize that these concepts are relative to a given time and place and as such may be differentially elaborated and perceived from one setting to another. While the misuse or misreading of "tu" versus "Ud." may be inconsequential in classroom exchanges, in true interactions it may have considerable social repercussions. Although their basic value and usage can be taught by rule specification, their semantic polivalence and social significance can only be apprehended by long and intense exposure to a Spanish-speaking setting rather than by formal training. (Author/CFM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Yolanda Rubinovich Solé
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER.

ED135203

FL008185

Sociocultural Determinants of Symmetrical and Asymmetrical Address Forms in Spanish

Sociolinguistic theory, which underscores the societal embeddedness of verbal behavior, has shown us how inadequate it is to think of language as a code-centered activity detached from a social matrix. As a result most applied linguists have expanded their conception of language and language competence. Language competence, hitherto understood as the ability to code a given message, embraces today the ability to select linguistic forms according to their appropriateness within a given context. The aim of foreign-language teaching has shifted accordingly, becoming more inclusive. Its ultimate goal is the attainment of communicative competence, which presupposes the mastery of the linguistic code itself.

Although the sociolinguistic view of language competence has prevailed in theory over societally detached approaches, in actual pedagogical practice few advances have been made. The reasons for this lag are obvious. While it may be self-evident that verbal behavior is highly interdependent with non-verbal behavior, the discovery of these interdependences is far from a simple task. The difficulties of this task are further increased in the case of pedagogically oriented materials. The inclusion of the sociocultural determinants of usage within the target language inevitably calls for a contrastive presentation of the sociocultural dimensions within the source

language. In case of widely spread languages, such as Spanish and English, these dimensions become even more complex due to the existence of pluralistic sociocultural patterns within their respective settings.

As a result of these complexities the teaching of Spanish has continued to proceed on the assumption that the linguistic code of educated speakers and the norms governing communicative appropriateness (when considered) remain relatively invariant from speaker to speaker and from one region to another. This assumption rests on a unisocial view of the Spanish-speaking countries in Latin America, which is primarily derived from the fact that they share a common past based upon the Spanish conquest and heritage. Their actualities, however, which differ considerably due to other historical and contemporary influences, reveal a multisocial reality and the existence of pluralistic sociocultural patterns. Our awareness of the multisocial reality of Spanish-speaking America should, therefore, sensitize us to the probability of variance in its linguistic component as well. Linguistic variance may occur in the composition, distribution, and/or function of some linguistic items. The source of variance may respond to country of origin, level of education, rural/urban procedence, sex and age differentials. If the aim of foreign language teaching is to be communicative competence, then some of the sociocultural determinants of usage of some forms should not be overlooked.

The basic and simplest act of communicative competence in Spanish involves the appropriate decoding and selection of the pronominal address forms tú and Ud.* Tú and Ud. operate in all speech events that

* The tuteo in some countries is expressed through vos instead of tú. The distribution, semantics and privileges of co-occurrence with nominal address forms of vos, are parallel to those of tú. Tú/vos may, therefore, be considered variants of the familiar form, which alternate according to country of origin differentials.

involve two or more interlocutors, whether they be overtly given or implied in the verbal form. Their selection and semantic value ~~is~~ are not, however, determined by linguistic criteria alone. Since tú/Ud. mark the relative status of each speaker in a given context, their selection is primarily dependent upon sociocultural factors. As tú and Ud. link grammar with sociodemographic and sociocultural variables, their distribution and value, more so than that of other linguistic items, are least likely to remain invariant from speaker to speaker and from one setting to another.

Traditionally, the pedagogical approach to these forms has been a semantic one. Tú has been categorized as familiar or informal, Ud. as formal or deferential. Few if any references have been made to the underlying determinants of their usage, from which their actual semantic polivalence arises. An exclusively semantic approach, however, in the teaching of pronominal address forms in unlikely to insure appropriate usage because it obscures two fundamental aspects: the underlying criteria of selection, and the fact that the values of tú versus Ud. are not inherent properties of the terms themselves, but a function of their sociolinguistic context. The inadequacy of the semantic approach in the teaching of tú versus Ud. becomes evident as one considers the range of either form. Tú may be informal and familiar, expressive of like-mindedness or solidarity, and Ud. may be formal or expressive of social or emotional distance. These dimensions, however, cover only two points of what in reality is best depicted as a continuum of expressive possibilities. Ud. may signal formality, courtesy, deference, social or psychological distance, and respect. More often than not, it is, however, an unmarked conventional

form used in all exchanges that involve interlocutors who are strangers or only casually acquainted with each other. Tú may be expressive of informality, familiarity, affection or intimacy. It may, nevertheless, also reflect rage, contempt, condescendence, and similar negative emotions. Yet between children and young adolescents, tú is the conventional address form unmarked by any of the former features. Whether tú or Ud. convey one shade of meaning or another cannot be determined from their occurrence in a single context, but must be derived from their distribution in two or more speech contexts. Their distribution (and semantic value) on the other hand, can only be ascertained by taking into account several dimensions: (1) the interpersonal relationship of the speakers; (2) the norms governing personal relationships within a given setting; (3) the personal characteristics of the speakers--country of origin, rural/urban procedence, level of education, sex and age; (4) the speech context in which the exchange occurs; and (5) the neutrality or affectivity of the speech event itself.

If the language learner is to gain some insight into the distribution and potential value of each form, he must first be made aware of the factors that determine it. He cannot be expected to deduce these factors on his own from a single speech context and a single role-relationship: the classroom and the student-teacher interaction. He must be explicitly told that there are differences in the usage of tú versus Ud. which depend upon the sociodemographic characteristics of the speakers. He must be alerted to the fact of pronominal switching, which may be demanded by the context of the speech event or be triggered by the emotional nature of the speech event regardless of setting. He must be informed that in addition to temporary fluctuations in pronominal usage, permanent switches may also occur once a

relationship is restructured. The language learner must further be taught that pronominal address forms may be used symmetrically and asymmetrically, and that certain conditions--but not others--may legitimize asymmetrical uses. Finally, inasmuch as pronominal address forms co-occur with nominal forms, he must also be shown their respective privileges of co-occurrence.

Even when all of the former dimensions are pointed out to the English-speaking learner, not all of the sources of error in selecting the appropriate pronominal form and in decoding its meaning accurately are eliminated. The student may well understand that tú/Ud. mark the relative status of each speaker, that formal contexts may require a symmetrical Ud., that symmetrical and asymmetrical uses are possible--just as they are in English with respect to nominal address forms. Yet status markers, formal/informal dimensions, and legitimate determinants of symmetrical and asymmetrical (pronominal or nominal) address forms are relative concepts. They are relative to a given time and place and as such may be differentially elaborated and perceived from one period and setting to another. If these dimensions are differentially defined, as they are in the English and Spanish-speaking worlds, then they must also be dealt with so that the language learner may perceive them for what they are, rather than to grasp them in terms of his own sociocultural presuppositions. It is only when the student understands how norms governing personal relationships, status markers, and formal/informal dimensions are defined in the Spanish-speaking world as opposed to English-speaking settings, that he can decode tú versus Ud. appropriately and use it accordingly.

If tú is taught as informal or familiar without further qualifications, students tend to decode it as the 'friendly' form. By

extension they tend to equate it with all informal interactions and use it in relation to all interlocutors, regardless of age, sex, and other status differentials. Thinking it indicates friendliness and openness, students often use tú in conjunction with nominal address forms, last names, and/or titles, which in Spanish co-occur with Ud. Equating tú with the usage of the first name in English, which in Spanish may either co-occur with tú or Ud., students tend to use it regardless of generational distance and other differentials. The decoding of Ud. does not fare much better. Categorized traditionally as formal, Ud. is often perceived as reserved and even unfriendly by English-speakers. Many a student who returns from a Summer living with a family in a Spanish-speaking country, often complains of the distance the family maintained towards him. When asked as to the reason for his feelings, he replies that he did not achieve or was not even offered to be on a tú or first name basis with the heads of the household. Misreadings such as the ones mentioned are altogether too common. While the misuse or misreading of tú versus Ud. may be inconsequential in classroom exchanges, in true interactions it may have considerable social repercussions. It is for these latter reasons that tú and Ud. merit more than passing attention in the teaching of Spanish if the language learner is to attain a minimum of communicative competence and is to avoid cross-cultural misunderstandings and disappointments. Although at present there is no exhaustive data on the distribution and semantic values of tú versus Ud. for all of the Spanish-speaking countries, there is, nevertheless, adequate evidence from individual studies and literary writings which permits us to arrive at the following generalizations.

Common general patterns

1. Symmetrical and asymmetrical pronominal uses

Pronominal usage may be symmetrical or asymmetrical. Symmetrical uses, whether tú or Ud., occur in the Spanish-speaking countries whenever an egalitarian view of human relationships prevails over a hierarchic view. Symmetrical address forms tend to prevail in metropolitan settings among younger middle and upper-class individuals. By and large, class differentials in pronominal usage tend to override country of original differentials. Whether tú or Ud. occurs depends on the nature of the relationship between the speakers, the social or emotional distance that separates them, and the setting in which the exchange occurs. The unmarked form Ud. is universally considered the appropriate address form between adult interlocutors who are only casually acquainted with each other or whose relationship is one of a transactional nature: physician-patient, salesperson-customer, teacher-student, waiter-customer, lawyer-client, etc. A reciprocal tú, on the other hand, occurs between children, adolescents, and those adults who are related by blood, marriage, or tied by bonds of personal friendship, provided they are not separated by generational distance or relative authority. Friends, when separated by one or more generations or highly unequal status configurations, may either exchange a reciprocal or non-reciprocal form. In such cases individual idiosyncracies and relative age tend to determine pronominal usage. Among the younger generations of upper-class status a reciprocal tú may prevail. Among older generations of middle and lower-class status, a non-reciprocal form tends to occur more often.

Asymmetrical uses emerge and are considered legitimate whenever two people are separated by generational distance or relative authority. Asymmetrical forms of address, nominal and pronominal, respond most frequently

to age differentials, which are most closely observed in those settings in which the basis of other invidious status distinctions is absent or undeveloped. Thus asymmetrical uses based on this dimension are most likely to be found in rural areas or urban contexts among populations which are relatively homogeneous or in which class differentials are of recent origin. In large metropolitan areas which contain long standing elites and where social class differences are more developed, the seniority principle tends to be altered. Asymmetrical address forms based upon age are, therefore, less frequent in such settings. Where age deference and the seniority principle do prevail, they tend to be more developed among males than females. Authority in Latin America is more commonly ascribed to and exercised by males; males are, therefore, more likely to use asymmetrical address forms than females.

Asymmetrical address forms may occur within and outside of the family domain. They occur most commonly within the family domain among rural or recently urbanized low and lower middle-class individuals whenever age differentials exceed one generation. Parents, grandparents, uncles, aunts, etc., may use tú when addressing their children, grandchildren, nephews, and nieces respectively. Fathers and mothers-in-law may also use tú when addressing their sons and daughters-in-law. The younger generation, on the other hand, responds with an asymmetrical Ud. Among middle and upper-class individuals of urban extraction, asymmetrical address forms within the family domain are infrequent, because the family structure tends to be more egalitarian among them.

Asymmetrical address forms may also occur outside of the family sphere among friends and acquaintances of low, middle, and upper-class status

when generational distances legitimize its usage. Adults address all children and preadolescents with tú, while the latter respond with an asymmetrical Ud. Asymmetrical pronominal usage is also common among friends who are separated by one or more generations. Barring a personal relationship between the speakers, asymmetrical uses of pronominal forms are considered distasteful in other domains than those of the family and friendship. Only a paternalistic or maternalistic stance in other role-relationships would authorize the usage of an asymmetrical tú on the part of the individual in whom greater authority is vested: a physician to his patient, a clergyman to his parishioner, a teacher to his student, etc.

The occurrence of asymmetrical uses of tú/Ud. in impersonal, transactional situations tends to underscore hierarchic dimensions: social class and/or race differentials. The asymmetrical tú in relation to one's social inferior or subordinate, while not uncommon in the past, is far less frequent today among the younger generations in urban settings. It may still occur in rural and smaller urban contexts among lower-class speakers, but it is virtually non-existent in metropolitan settings among middle and upper-class individuals. The subordinate tú seems to have been the universal form of addressing the indigenous populations, manual laborers, and domestic servants in the past. Today, however, the signorial tú is considered incongruent with the more egalitarian view of human relationships prevalent. Consequently, regardless of social and/or race differentials, a reciprocal Ud. prevails between superiors and subordinates unless generational distance, a long term acquaintance, or a paternalistic stance should authorize an asymmetrical exchange. In some cases even a mutual tú may be exchanged, particularly in the case of

domestic servants vis à vis their employers when they have known the latter since their childhood.

2. Context

a. Under Public Control

i. Formal domains

The selection and appropriateness of tú versus Ud. is further dependent upon the context of the speech event. A formal context, in which the impersonal nature of the transaction is underscored, demands a reciprocal Ud. among its participants, regardless of their personal relationship in other spheres. Formal contexts in the Spanish-speaking world encompass court sessions, congress debates, large business meetings, assemblies, and classes and oral examinations at the high school and college level. If two or more interlocutors are on a tú basis, pronominal switching to Ud. is automatically triggered in these circumstances.

ii. Religious ceremonies and rituals

In all Christian sacraments and rituals, where the fatherly aspect of the ecclesiastical authority is emphasized or the notion of Christian brotherhood underscored, the ritual tú prevails. The ritual tú in Catholic sacraments is largely the result of its translational equivalent from Latin. In prayers and religious songs not derived from Latin, either tú or the archaic vos may occur. Whether vos or tú is found depends upon the source, date or origin, and the underlying conceptualization of the deity or saints. In prayers and songs of popular origin, whether of recent vintage or not, in which the fatherly or motherly aspects of the deity or saints is emphasized, tú tends to occur. In prayers and songs in which the lordly aspect of the deity is underscored--a

feature more prevalent in past centuries--the archaic vos is used instead. In rhetorical addresses at funerals or eulogies only tú is found. The tú of fraternal solidarity in this latter case probably responds as much to the notion of Christian brotherhood as to the fact that death cancels all possible social differentials.

iii. Proverbs and advertisements

Spanish proverbs occur with tú due to their didactic purpose, popular origins, and universal applicability: "Dime con quien andas y te diré quien eres," "Quien bien te quiere, te hará llorar," "El buy y tu mujer, de tu tierra deben ser." In advertisements, on the other hand, either tú or Ud. may be found depending upon their source and addressee. In political slogans, which tend to be normative in purpose and paternalistic in tone, tú is generally used: "Ciudadano, tú que sabes leer, debes votar." In commercial advertisements, in which the exchange between the source and addressee is one of an instrumental nature, Ud. is more common: "Si se siente mal, tómese un mejoral," "Siéntese más limpia que con jabón, use Zest."

b. Under Private Control

In domains under private control in which an object is evoked, as in silent prayers, inner dialogues, and in those artistic expressions which are markedly subjective and intimate, such as lyric poetry, tú is the norm. Since the ego is both the source and the target of covert speech, social conventions play no role in this sphere. In lyric poetry, which may be thought of as an objectification of feelings, the tú applies whether the evoked object is animate or inanimate but personified: "Tú, tú, tú mi incesante Primavera profunda!" (Jorge Guillén); "Juventud, divino tesoro, ya te vas para no volver!" (Rubén Darío);

"Siempre te ven mis ojos, ciudad de mis días marinos," (Vicente Aleixandre). An exception within the lyric context are those poems in which a human subject is addressed with the titles señor or señora, and which can either co-occur with tú or the archaic vos: ". . . a besarte las manos reverente me llego, mi señor Don Quijote, Caballero inmortal" (Manuel Bonache Romero); "No os ofendáis, señora, porque esta vez a vuestro oído llega el verso amante del que en voz adora . . ." (José Santos Chocano).

3. Pronominal switching

a. Permanent: restructuring of a relationship

When a relationship between two people is restructured from more distant to more intimate or personal, a pronominal switch from Ud. to tú tends to co-occur with it, unless the interlocutors are separated by generational distance and/or highly unequal power configurations. The person in whom greater authority is vested proposes the tuteo. The addressee reciprocates with tú, if she/he is inclined to accepting the proposed restructuring of the relationship. If, however, the addressee wishes to remain on a more distant basis, his/her continued usage of Ud. will implicitly convey that message. When age differentials exceed one generation or power configurations are highly unequal, asymmetrical forms of address may emerge, unless the restructuring entails marriage. If the latter is the case, reciprocal pronominal addresses would automatically follow. In other cases, the younger or lower status individual addresses his/her friend with an asymmetrical Ud., while the latter replies with tú. Whether the usage of the first name co-occurs with the restructuring of the relationship and the pronominal switch, depends also upon age and power differentials. Among

equals on a tú basis, the usage of the first name co-occurs with the tuteo. When generational distance exceeds one or more generations, and the interlocutors belong to the same sex, Ud. or tú may co-occur with the first name. Between the sexes, however, the usage of tú and the first name is less common when generational distance obtains. The older person tends to be addressed with Ud., don or doña plus the first name (or the last name in case of males), while the younger interlocutor is called his/her first name and tú.

Whereas the restructuring of a relationship from more distant to more intimate generally entails a permanent pronominal switch, the converse does not apply. When an intimate relationship characterized by a reciprocal tú is altered or severed, it rarely entails a permanent switch to Ud. Parents and offspring, husbands and wives, friends and lovers, who once exchanged a mutual tú do not switch to Ud. in case of permanent estrangements. Although the tú is subject to switching under highly affect-invested conditions, it is generally not permanently withdrawn once it has been associated with relationships as intimate as those mentioned above.

b. Temporary: affective speech events

The traditional descriptions of tú as familiar or intimate and of Ud. as formal or courteous are not necessarily mutually exclusive and only depict one of the possible shades of meaning of each form. Respect or deference, normally associated with hierarchic relationships, is not necessarily lacking among people who exchange a reciprocal tú; nor is solidarity or intimacy exclusively associated with tú since it obtains among interlocutors who exchange a reciprocal Ud., such as close friends, parents and offspring,

grandparents and grandchildren, etc. The multiple semantic possibilities of tú versus Ud. are not always easily detected or explained because they respond to psychological motivations which are not directly observable and are the product of highly strained conditions. The pronominal switching that occurs under these circumstances does not necessarily reflect a restructuring of the relationship between the speakers, since it responds to emotional upheavals which are transitory.

The most common form of pronominal switching occurs among members who show high solidarity and normally exchange a reciprocal tú. The switching to Ud. generally takes place when hostility, anger, or rage underlies the linguistic message. Under these conditions the person in whom greater authority is vested switches to Ud., making his authority momentarily prevail over his affection. The switching to Ud. is frequent between parents and children, husbands and wives. When initiated by a parent, it triggers a switch to Ud. on the offspring's part, until the parent himself switches back to tú. Pronominal switches among friends are less common as they would call for far more aggravated circumstances than those that might trigger it between parents and children, husbands and wives. The neutral connotations of deference associated with Ud. may also easily be altered when irony, contempt, or sarcasm underlies the linguistic message. The social distance denoted by Ud. may also be reinforced when a particular speaker wishes to reassert the social or emotional distance that separates him from a particular interlocutor. The switch from a reciprocal Ud. to a non-reciprocal tú may occur between equals or between subordinate and superior in highly affect-invested exchanges. Love, hate, indignation, loss of consciousness, the effects of alcohol, etc., may trigger

the switch to a non-reciprocal tú. While a pronominal switch on the subordinate's part when caused by affection, love, or passion is not uncommon and carries with it few if any sanctions, when triggered by the more destructive emotions, it may represent a serious social transgression. For these reasons a non-reciprocal switch to tú caused by rage and loss of self-control is fairly infrequent. The best illustrations of this type of pronominal switching are provided by literary writings, particularly realistic plays and novels, in which a variety of social contexts and interactions of characters of diverse backgrounds are recreated. The tú of subvocal or covert speech, mentioned earlier, is also illustrated in literature through monologues and stream of consciousness passages. Its usage in these cases, in which the ego is both the source and target of the exchange, is by far more common than the non-reciprocal tú in overt speech because the individual is protected from the sanctions that a transgression, signalled by the asymmetrical tú, could bring about in overt exchange.

4. Co-occurrence with nominal address forms

Nominal address forms--first names, last names, and titles--are not in free variation with tú and Ud. Tú may co-occur with first and last names, whereas Ud. can co-occur with all three--first names, last names and titles. Among equals who are friends, tú co-occurs with the first name. The usage of tú with the last name--but without a title such as señor--is common among adolescents and adult males who are not close friends but merely acquainted with each other. This address form is frequent among classmates, co-workers, and men in the military; and it represents a higher degree of solidarity than the usage of the last name with Ud. Among females, however, the usage of the last name with tú is virtually non-existent. Females (and males) do, however,

use the last name with Ud. when interacting with male friends who are much older than they when a last-name address form--without a title--has been suggested by the elder. Nominal, as well as pronominal usage should be initiated by the superior--the elder, the more distinguished of the two, the more affluent, etc.--in order to avoid the risk of seeming brash and intrusive. In teacher-student interactions at the high school and university level, students are addressed with their last name and Ud. by their teachers. The teachers in turn are addressed by their students with a title, profesor-a, doctor-a, señor, señorita. The co-occurence of the last name is optional.

Nominal titles, señor-a, señorita, and occupational titles accorded people in certain statuses, doctor, profesor, ingeniero, licenciado, etc., co-occur only with Ud. Whether the linguistic message is neutral or contains undertones of humor, irony, or sarcasm, if a last name and title are used, Ud. must co-occur with them. This applies whether the usage represents a case of switching or whether it corresponds to the regular pattern between the speakers. An apparent exception to this rule would be religious prayers in which the deity is addressed as Señor, and yet tú co-occurs with it. In this latter case, however, Señor may be thought of as a proper name rather than an address form.

Polite discourse in Spanish requires the co-occurence of a title in such routines as affirmations, "sí, señor"; denials, "no, señorita"; the request for information, "dispense, señora, podría decirme dónde queda la calle Sulpacha"; and the giving of thanks, "gracias, señorita". Unlike the English mister and Mrs., the Spanish señor-a may occur with or without a last name.* They are not restricted to elderly addressees, as are their English equivalents

* The English miss may, of course, be used when the last name is unknown. While mister can also be found without a last name, its semantic value in such instances is altered as it would be caustic or hyperaffectionate rather than polite.

sir and madam, and are consequently less deferential.* Whereas English lacks other nominal address forms if the last name is unknown, the Spanish señor-a and señorita can always be used regardless of whether the person is a stranger or an acquaintance. If the stranger is an adolescent male, joven is used instead of señor. In addressing adolescent females, joven alternates with señorita. Joven, as opposed to other titles, cannot co-occur with the first or last name. Its usage is, therefore, restricted to strangers.

Differential patterns

1. Patriarchal vestiges and sex differentials

Sex differentials in the usage of pronominal forms largely depend upon the survival of the patriarchal idea of male dominance, in which greater authority is ascribed to males. Where there remain strong vestiges of the patriarchal idea, the male not only initiates the tuteo, but also uses the non-reciprocal tú in all role-relationships involving females more often than when the interlocutors are males. Fathers-in-law use tú more often in relation to their daughters than sons-in-law; sons-in-law use tú more often in relation to their mothers than fathers-in-law; husbands use it more often when addressing their wives' female friends, than wives do when addressing their husbands' friends. The male also tends to use the subordinate or non-reciprocal tú more often within the work sphere than females, particularly in factories and in relation to domestic servants. Male-female power configurations tend to be the most unequal whenever the relationship between the sexes is most specifically sexual. Sexual segregation is also high in these cases. Where these conditions apply, females are highly selective in their usage of tú, particularly vis à vis males outside of the family domain. Their selectivity is basically

* When madam co-occurs with titles, madam ambassador, it is still equivalent to the Spanish señora, señora embajadora. The usage of sir within the military does not, however, correspond to señor. In Spanish it could only be rendered by the rank title of the individual teniente, capitán, general, etc.

determined by their concern with propriety and decorum, since the usage of tú in relation to males outside of the family sphere could easily be misinterpreted as a sign of intimacy. For these reasons the tú among females outside of the family domain may be relegated to members of their own sex.

Although the ideal of male dominance prevails in much of Latin America, it is least operative in highly differentiated metropolitan settings among the younger generations of middle and upper class status. Conversely, it is most likely to be adhered to by the older generations of lower-class status in rural areas or by recently urbanized populations. Consequently, a reciprocal tú between the sexes is much more likely to prevail among younger people in urban settings than among the older generations of rural extraction or in rural areas. Nevertheless, regardless of social class and/or rural/urban differences, the tú between the sexes is automatic only among children and adolescents. Among adults, it occurs when bonds of a common family origin or friendship are present.

2. Traditional versus more modernized settings

The more traditional the socioeconomic structure of a society is, the greater the lack of upward mobility among its members tends to be. If there is also a strong social cleavage among its classes, status differentials tend to be observed rather strictly. Under these conditions the distribution of tú is more restricted than in more modernized settings. The basis of solidarity and affinity in the more traditional Latin American settings still arises primarily from common family and/or social class origins. Conversely, in those settings with modernized and more complex socioeconomic structures in which upward mobility is easier, solidarity and affinity tend to be derived from achieved rather than ascribed characteristics. Consequently, the tú

tends to be distributed more widely. Although in most of Latin America the family group, nuclear and extended, subsists as the primary basis of solidarity, other relationships have become integrated into this sphere and have come to acquire the same importance. For example in San Juan, Santiago de Chile, Buenos Aires, and Mexico City, young adults may easily exchange a reciprocal tú at clubs, at college, and even at work. In Lima and Bogotá, on the other hand, the relationships arising within those spheres do not necessarily engender common solidarity feelings which warrant--in time--a mutual tú. Whether the tú is ultimately extended or not depends in the end upon the affinity between the individuals, rather than upon the shared experiences within those domains. In casual encounters, however, in public places, streets, parks, restaurants, etc., strangers young and old always address each other with Ud.

Conclusions

Although the Spanish pronominal address forms, tú versus Ud., can be linked to the English address forms, first name versus last name and title, their distribution and semantic value do not stand in a one to one correspondence. In modern American English the distance between a mutual first name represents a small increment of intimacy over the mutual last name and title among equals. The distance from one form to another may be as small sometimes as five minutes of conversation. In introducing social acquaintances or new work-colleagues within dyads of the same age and rank, the first name and last name are used so that the speakers can first-name each other. The exchange of the first name among equals, furthermore, bears little relationship to the affinity or antipathy existent between the speakers. Among co-workers, classmates, and neighbors of the same age and status, the first name is more of a convention

than an indicator of intimacy or friendship. The English speaker cannot and should not, therefore, expect to extend or receive the tú with the same ease with which the first name is used in the United States. The tú in most Spanish-speaking countries, except among the very young, still remains more of a privilege than a convention, being tied to familiarity and intimacy rather than to mere solidarity.

Symmetrical and asymmetrical exchanges occur in both Spanish and English, but the factors that trigger it do not coincide in all instances. While occupational status and/or age differentials may generate nonreciprocal address forms in Spanish and in English, in Spanish older acquaintances receive the deferential Ud. regardless of status differentials. In the American address system, familiarity among equals can neutralize age differentials and the speakers may come to exchange a mutual first name. In the Spanish address system, age differences are less easily neutralized. The reciprocal familiar address form, tú, may not merely be delayed, but be unlikely to occur altogether. In both Spanish and English the right to initiate a change of address belongs to the superior when there is a clear difference of status between the speakers. The person higher in status is the pacesetter in linguistic address forms and all acts of increased intimacy. Permanent shifts in address, from more distant to more familiar, occur in both languages. In English, however, no distinction in address is made to equals or subordinates since both are denoted with the first name. In Spanish, tú, except among the young, is generally an indicator of intimacy. The subordinate tú, on the other hand, is considered both improper and distasteful by most middle and upper-class speakers.

The temporary switching that occurs in Spanish in both directions--

from tú to Ud. and, viceversa, from Ud. to tú--under highly emotional conditions has no overt equivalent in English. The semantic values of Spanish pronominal forms, are, therefore, much more complex than those of the English address system. Although their basic value and usage can be taught by rule specification, their whole range of meaning cannot be taught so easily. Their semantic polivalence and social significance can only be apprehended by long and intense exposure to a Spanish-speaking setting rather than by formal training.

Yolanda Solé
The University of Texas at Austin

Bibliography

Almasov, A. "Vos and Vosotros as Formal Address in Modern Spanish," Hispania, 57, 1974, 304-312.

_____. "Special use of Tú and Usted," Hispania, 57, 1974, 56-57.

Brown, P. "The use of Tú and Ud. with Parents by some Mexican-American Students," Hispania, 58-1975-126-127.

Brown, R. nd M. Ford. "Address in American English," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 62, 1961, 375-385.

Brown, R. and A. Gilman. "The Pronouns of Power and Solidarity," in Style in Language, T. Sebeok (ed.). Cambridge: Massachussetts Institute of Technology Press, 1960, 253-276.

_____ "Who says Tu to whom," Etc.: A Review of General Semantics, XV, 1958, 169-174.

Fontanella de Weinberg, M.A. "Voseo en Buenos Aires en las dos primeras décadas del siglo XIX," Thesaurus, XXVI, 1971, 495-514.

_____ "La evolución de los pronombres de tratamiento en el español bonaerense," Thesaurus, XXV, 1970, 12-22.

De Gregorio de Mac, M.I. El voseo en la literature argentina. Santa Fe, Argentina, 1967.

Ervin-Tripp, S.A. "Sociolinguistics," in Advances in Experimental Social Psychology 4, L. Berkowitz (ed.). New York: Academic Press, 1969, 91-165.

Friedrich, P. "Structure Implications of Russian Pronominal Usage," in Sociolinguistics, W. Bright (ed.). The Hague: Mouton and Company, 1966, 214-253.

Kany, E.C. American-Spanish Syntax. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1951.

Lambert, N.E. "The use of Tu and Vous as forms of address in French Canada: A Pilot Study," Journal of Verbal Learning, 6, 614-617. 1967

Lastra Suarez, Y. "Los pronombres de tratamiento en la ciudad de México," Anuario de Letras, X, 1972, 213-217.

Marín, D. "El uso de tú y Ud. en el español actual," Hispania, 55, 1972, 904-908.

Miquel i Vergés, M.E. "Fórmulas de tratamiento en la ciudad de México," Anuario de Letras, III, 1963-35-86.

Solé, Y.R. "Correlaciones socio-culturales del uso de tú/vos y Ud. en la Argentina, Perú y Puerto Rico," Thesaurus, XXV, 1970, 1-35.

Sologuren, J. "Fórmulas de tratamiento en el Perú," Nueva Revista de Filología Hispánica, VIII, 1964, 241-267.

Weber de Kurlat, F. "Fórmulas de cortesía en la lengua de Buenos Aires," Filología, 12, 1968, 137-192.